

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments, re-examination and reconsideration of the subject matter identified in caption, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.112, and in light of the remarks which follow are respectfully requested.

At the outset, in response to the requirement for restriction, Applicants confirm the election of the invention of Group I, claims 22-32 and 34-37. Applicants also confirm the species election of bisphenol A as polyphenol curing agent, the phosphazene compound of Formula (12) as curing accelerator, and metal-coated organic particles as the conductive bead.

By the present amendment, Applicants have canceled claims 22-28, 30-33, 36-44 and 46-49 without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 68 combines the features of canceled claims 28 and 33 and adds features disclosed in the specification, for example, on pages 27-29 and 40-41. The features of new claim 69 are disclosed on page 28, lines 15-19 and page 107, line 15. Applicants believe that no new matter has been added. Claims 29, 34, 35, 45 and 50-69 are currently pending in this application with claims 45 and 50-67 withdrawn from consideration.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement and the Election of Species Requirement are respectfully requested. Applicants have combined the features of Groups I and II into one set of claims: independent claim 68 and dependent claims 29, 34, 35 and 69. Also, the number of claims in Groups III and IV have been significantly reduced with the remainder being directly or indirectly dependent upon claims 68, 69, 29,

34 and 35. All claims remaining in this application are believed to be directed to a single general inventive concept as defined in PCT Rule 13.1.

The species election was made for search purposes only. The documents relied upon by the Examiner in the prior art rejections are inapplicable to the presently amended claims. All species encompassed by the generic terminology used in the claims are patentable over the cited documents.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, the Restriction and Election of Species Requirements should be withdrawn and all remaining claims examined on the merits. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Claims 25-32, 34, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly containing improper Markush terminology. In response, the remaining claims, as amended, contain proper Markush terminology. Accordingly, the §112 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,578,697 to Kawamonzen et al and claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Kawamonzen et al '697 for reasons set forth on page 6 of the Office Action.

Claims 22-24 have been canceled. Accordingly, the above rejections have been rendered moot.

Claims 22, 25 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by JP 5-97965 or U.S. Patent No. 5,162,400 to Shiobara et al for reasons presented on page 7

of the Office Action. Claims 23, 24 and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over JP '965 or Shiobara et al '400 as set forth on page 7 of the Office Action.

Claims 22-25 and 30-32 have been canceled. Claims 29 and 34 are now dependent upon new claim 68. Neither JP '965 or Shiobara et al '400 discloses or suggests a composition as described in claim 68. Accordingly, these rejections have been obviated and should be withdrawn.

Claims 22-32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Japanese Patent Nos. 55-77722, 62-295029, 5-262850, 10-273644 and 10-15005 in view of Japanese Patent No. 5-97965 and Shiobara et al '400 for reasons given on pages 7-8 of the Office Action. Reconsideration of these rejections are requested.

Claims 22-28 and 30-32 have been canceled. Claims 29 and 34 are dependent upon new claim 68. Neither of JP '722, '029, '850, '644 nor '005 disclose or suggest compositions as described in claims 68 or 69, specifically compositions containing rubber-like polymer fine particles (claim 68) or acryl polymer particles (claim 69). JP '965 and Shiobara et al '400 likewise fail to describe the presence of such particles.

The combined disclosures of the cited documents do not render obvious the invention of the present claims. Accordingly, the §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,730,086 to Kamijo et al for reasons expressed on page 8 of the Office Action.

Since these claims have been canceled, this rejection has been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

Claims 22-32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Japanese Patent Nos. 2-153930, 4-85324, 4-139210, 7-94641, 8-245759 and 11-40587 in view of Japanese Patent No. 5-97965 and Shiobara et al '400 for the reasons given on pages 8-9 of the Official Action. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons.

Claims 22-28 and 30-32 have been canceled. Claims 29 and 34 are now dependent on new claim 68. Neither JP '930, '324, '210, '641, '759 nor '587 disclose or suggest sealant compositions containing, *inter alia*, 1 to 15 mass % of rubber-like polymer fine particles having a softening point of 0°C or lower where the primary particles have an average particle diameter of 5 μ m or less. The JP '965 and Shiobara et al '400 documents likewise contain no disclosure or suggestion of sealants as defined in claims 68-69.

The combined disclosures of the above cited documents do not render obvious the compositions of the present claims. Accordingly, this §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Japanese Patent Nos. 55-77722, 62-295029, 5-262850, 10-273644 and 10-15005 and Japanese Patent Nos. 2-153930, 4-85324, 4-139210, 7-94641, 8-245759 and 11-40587 as applied to claims 22-32 and 34 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,297,332 to Urakami et al for the reasons provided on page 9 of the Office Action.

Also, claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Japanese Patent Nos. 55-77722, 62-295029, 5-262850, 10-273644 and 10-15005 and Japanese Patent Nos. 2-153930, 4-85324, 4-139210, 7-94641, 8-245759 and 11-40587 as applied to claims 22-32 and 34 above, and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 9-199206 for the reasons given on page 10 of the Office Action.

Claims 36 and 37 have been canceled. Accordingly, these rejections are moot and should be withdrawn.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (703) 838-6683 at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: August 4, 2003

By: George F. Lesmes
George F. Lesmes
Registration No. 19,995

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620